SUPREME COURT MINUTES MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 2011 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S045078

PEOPLE v. CLARK (ROYAL)

Opinion filed: Judgment affirmed in full Majority Opinion by Cantil-Sakauye, C. J.

-- joined by Baxter, Chin, Corrigan, and Kriegler*, JJ.

Concurring & Dissenting Opinion by Kennard, J.

Concurring & Dissenting Opinion by Werdegar, J.

* Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

S123813

PEOPLE v. FLINNER (MICHAEL WILLIAM)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to October 31, 2011.

S139789

HARRIS (MAURICE LYDELL) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Anne W. Lackey's representation that she anticipates filing the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus by September 27, 2011, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to September 27, 2011. After that date, no further extension will be granted.

S190647 B217709/B221833 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 PEOPLE v. CABALLERO (RODRIGO)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to September 30, 2011.

S079925

PEOPLE v. MORA (JOSEPH ADAM) & RANGEL (RUBEN)

Order filed

The order filed on August 17, 2011, is hereby amended to read in its entirety: Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Tara K. Hoveland's representation that she anticipates filing appellant Ruben Rangel's reply brief by March 1, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to October 17, 2011. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 136 additional days are contemplated.

S195684

PETERSON (PHILLIP ANTHONY) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.